arXiv:1510.01629v10 [hep-ph] 9 Sep 2016

Kaon regeneration in perturbation theory

V.I. Nazaruk

Institute for Nuclear Research of RAS, 60th October Anniversary Prospect 7a, 117312 Moscow, Russia.*

Abstract

$K^0\bar{K}^0$ transitions in a medium followed by decay and regeneration of K^0_S-component are considered by means of perturbation theory. It is shown that in the previous calculations the problem different from regeneration is solved. Our result coincides with the result of the model based on exact solution of equations of motion.

PACS: 11.30.Fs; 13.75.Cs

Keywords: perturbation theory, regeneration, infrared divergences

*E-mail: nazaruk@inr.ru

1 Introduction

We consider the $K^0\bar{K}^0$ transitions in the medium followed by decay:

$$(K^0 - \text{medium}) \to (\bar{K}^0 - \text{medium}) \to (f - \text{medium}) \tag{1}$$

(f are the decay products) by means of perturbation theory. The regeneration is considered as well.

The effect of kaon regeneration is known since the 1950s. The motive of our paper is as follows. In the previous calculations [1-5] the amplitude of regenerated K_S^0 is proportional to the factor $f_{21}/\Delta m$. Here $f_{21} = f - \bar{f}$, $\Delta m = m_L - m_S$, where m_L and m_S are the masses of stationary states, f and $\bar{f}$ are the forward scattering amplitudes of K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$, respectively. As this takes place, f_{21} and Δm are the crucial values which define the process speed. In our opinion the inverse dependence takes place.

Indeed, in our calculation the amplitude of regenerated K_S^0 is $\epsilon/V \sim \Delta m/f_{21}$ (see Eqs. (24) and (25)). We show that the reason of disagreement is that in the standard calculations [1-5] the non-coupled equations of motion are used instead of system of coupled ones (see Eq. (26) and below). This means that the process model is wrong.

The regeneration arises from difference between the K^0N- and $\bar{K}^0N$-intereactions. We propouse the simple model which is typical for the theory of the multistep processes. We specify the initial and final states and interaction Hamiltonian. The calculation is performed by means of perturbation theory.

In Sect. 2 the $K^0\bar{K}^0$ transitions in the medium are considered. These results are used in Sect. 3, where the main calculation of regeneration is performed. Our and previous calculations are compared in Sect. 4. In Sect. 5 we touch on briefly the approach based on exact solution of equations of motion. Section 6 contains the conclusion.

2 $K^0\bar{K}^0$ transitions in the medium

The $K^0\bar{K}^0$ transitions in the medium are of independent interest. Besides, the results obtained are used in the model of regeneration.

2.1 Equations of motion

To understand the origin of the factor $\Delta m/f_{21}$ we write the coupled equations for zero momentum K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ in the medium:

$$(i\partial_t - M)K^0 = \epsilon\bar{K}^0, \tag{2}$$

$$[(i\partial_t - (M+V)]\bar{K}^0 = \epsilon K^0, \tag{3}$$

where

$$M = m_{K^0} + U_{K^0} - i\Gamma_{K^0}/2,$$
$$V = (m_{\bar{K}^0} - m_{K^0}) + (U_{\bar{K}^0} - U_{K^0}) - (i\Gamma_{\bar{K}^0}/2 - i\Gamma_{K^0}/2). \tag{4}$$

Here $\epsilon = (m_L - m_S)/2$ is a small parameter, U_{K^0} and $U_{\bar{K}^0}$ are the potentials of K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$, respectively. Below we put $m_{K^0} = m_{\bar{K}^0} = m$ and $\Gamma_{K^0} = \Gamma_{\bar{K}^0} = \Gamma$, where m and Γ are the mass and decay width of K^0, respectively.

The initial conditions are $K^0(t=0) = 1$ and $\bar{K}^0(t=0) = 0$. In the lowest order in ϵ

$$(i\partial_t - M)K^0(t) = 0,$$
$$K^0(t) = \exp(-iMt). \tag{5}$$

Substitution of $K^0(t)$ in (3) gives

$$\bar{K}^0(t) = \frac{\epsilon}{V}[\exp(-iVt) - 1]K^0(t),$$
$$V = U_{\bar{K}^0} - U_{K^0} = \frac{2\pi}{m} N f_{21}, \tag{6}$$

where N is the number of nuclei in a unit of volume.

Since $\mathrm{Im}U_{K^0} \ll \mathrm{Im}U_{\bar{K}^0}$, we put $\mathrm{Im}U_{K^0} = 0$ for simplicity. The probability of finding a $\bar{K}^0$ in a time t is found to be

$$I(\bar{K}^0) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\mid V \mid^2}[1 - 2\cos(\mathrm{Re}Vt)e^{\mathrm{Im}Vt} + e^{2\mathrm{Im}Vt}]e^{-\Gamma t}. \tag{7}$$

$I(\bar{K}^0)$ is damped out due to decay: $I(\bar{K}^0) \sim e^{-\Gamma t}$. The same is true for $K^0(t)$: $\mid K^0(t) \mid^2 = e^{-\Gamma t}$.

If $V \to 0$, $I(\bar{K}^0)$ coincides with the free-space $K^0\bar{K}^0$ transition probability [5]. As seen from (6), the factor $\epsilon/V \sim \Delta m/f_{21}$ is beyond question.



Figure 1: $K^0\bar{K}^0$ transition in the medium followed by decay.

2.2 Diagram technique

Let us consider the process (1) (see Fig. 1a). The physical aspects of the problem are primary goal of this paper. To draw the analogy to the well-studied $n\bar{n}$ transitions we consider the non-relativistic problem. The unperturbed and interaction Hamiltonians are

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= -\nabla^2/2m + U_{K^0}, \\ H_I &= H_{K^0\bar{K}^0} + H_W + V, \\ H_{K^0\bar{K}^0} &= \int d^3x(\epsilon\bar{\Psi}_{\bar{K}^0}(x)\Psi_{K^0}(x) + H.c.). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Here $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$ and H_W are the Hamiltonians of the $K^0\bar{K}^0$ conversion and decay of the K-mesons, respectively; $\bar{\Psi}_{\bar{K}^0}$ and Ψ_{K^0} are the fields of $\bar{K}^0$ and K^0, respectively. The background field U_{K^0} is included in the wave function of K^0:

$$K^0(x) = \Omega^{-1/2}\exp(-ipx), \tag{9}$$

where $p = (E, \mathbf{p})$ is the 4-momentum of K^0; $E = \mathbf{p}^2/2m + \mathrm{Re}U_{K^0}$. The calculation given below is unaffected by absorption and decay of incident particle (K^0 in this case) and so these effects will be taken into account in the final result (see last paragraph of Sect. 3).

In the lowest order in $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$ the amplitude M_1 of the process (1) is

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= \epsilon G(\bar{K}^0) M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to f), \\ G(\bar{K}^0) &= \frac{1}{E_1 - \mathbf{p}_1^2/2m - U_{\bar{K}^0} + i0} = -\frac{1}{V}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Here $M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to f)$ is the in-medium amplitude of the decay $\bar{K}^0 \to f$, $G(\bar{K}^0)$ is the propagator of the $\bar{K}^0$, E_1 and $\mathbf{p}_1$ are the energy and momentum of $\bar{K}^0$; $E_1 = E$, $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}$. The amplitude $M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to f)$ contains the all orders in H_W. For the process width Γ_1 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1 &= N\int d\Phi \mid M_1 \mid^2 = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\mid V \mid^2}\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \to f), \\ \Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \to f) &= N\int d\Phi \mid M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to f) \mid^2, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \to f)$ is the width of the decay $\bar{K}^0 \to f$. The normalization multiplier N is the same for Γ_1 and $\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \to f)$.

The process probability $W_1(t)$ is determined by exponential decay law: $W_1(t) = 1 - \exp(-\Gamma_1 t)$. If $\Gamma_1 t \ll 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(t) &\approx \Gamma_1 t = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\mid V \mid^2} W(\bar{K}^0 \to f), \\ W(\bar{K}^0 \to f) &= \Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \to f)t. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Here $W(\bar{K}^0 \to f)$ is the probability of decay $\bar{K}^0 \to f$ in a time t.

If $V = 0$, $M_1 \sim 1/0$ (see Fig. 1b). The same is true for the free-space process. In this case $U_{K^0} = V = 0$ and the process amplitude $M_1^v \sim 1/0$. This problem should be solved; otherwise the approach under study can be rejected.

For the $n\bar{n}$ transition the similar picture takes place. These are infrared singularities conditioned by zero momentum transfer in the $K^0\bar{K}^0$ ($n\bar{n}$) transition vertex. For solving the problem the field-theoretical approach with finite time interval has been proposed [6-8]. It is infrared free. The problem is formulated on the finite time interval as for the Eqs. (2), (3).

Denote: W_1^v and W_t^v are the free-space partial and total process (1) probabilities, respectively. The calculation identical to those of Ref. [8] gives

$$\begin{aligned} W_t^v(t) &= \epsilon^2 t^2, \\ W_1^v(t) &= W_t^v(t)\omega_{if}, \\ \omega_{if} &= \Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \to f)/\Gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$W_t^v(t)$ coincides with the well-known result for the free-space oscillations. (The t-dependence of (12) and (13) is different. This is well-known fact pertaining to exponential decay law. We are not go into this problem here.)

For the $n\bar{n}$ transition the similar calculation [9] gives the result which is proportional to that obtained by means of equations of motion (see Eqs. (15) and (16) of Ref. [9]). This fact as well as reproducing of the vacuum limit are the verification of the approach under consideration.

We would like to emphasize that $M_1 \sim \epsilon/V \sim \Delta m/f_{21}$ as well as $\bar{K}^0(t)$.



Figure 2: Decay $K^0 \to 2\pi$ in the medium. (b) and (c) correspond to zero and first orders in $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$, respectively.

3 Regeneration

We consider the regeneration of K_S^0-component. Let K_L^0 falls on the plate. For definitess, the decay into $\pi\pi$ is registered [10]. Since K^0N- and $\bar{K}^0N$-intereactions are known, we go into basis $(K^0, \bar{K}^0)$ using the vacuum relation

$$\mid K_L^0 >= (\mid K^0 > + \mid \bar{K}^0 >)/\sqrt{2}. \tag{14}$$

To this point kaon is in vacuum and the all states $\mid K_L^0 >$, $\mid K^0 >$ and $\mid \bar{K}^0 >$ are the vacuum states. We consider K^0-component in (14). The spatial wave function of the K^0 in the vacuum $K_v^0(x)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} K_v^0(x) = \Omega^{-1/2} \exp(-iEt + i\mathbf{p}_v\mathbf{x}), \\ E = \mathbf{p}_v^2/2m. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

For the wave function in the medium $K_m^0(x)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_m^0(x) = \Omega^{-1/2} \exp(-iEt + i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}), \\ E = \mathbf{p}^2/2m + \mathrm{Re}U_{K^0}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The sole difference between $K_v^0(x)$ and $K_m^0(x)$ is that $p \neq p_v$.

The coefficient of reflection is small:

$$\left(\frac{p - p_v}{p + p_v}\right)^2 \ll 1. \tag{17}$$

So for the K^0 with the in-medium wave function (16) one should describe the process (1), where $< f \mid = < \pi\pi \mid$. Recall the problem formulation. The wave function of initial state and interaction Hamiltonian are given by (16) and (8), respectively; $< f \mid = < \pi\pi \mid$. The perturbation theory in $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$ is used.

For the amplitude of the process $K^0 \to \pi\pi$ in the medium $M'(K^0 \to \pi\pi)$ we have

$$M'(K^0 \to \pi\pi) = M_d(K^0 \to \pi\pi) + \epsilon G(\bar{K}^0) M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to \pi\pi) \tag{18}$$

(see Fig. 2). $M_d(K^0 \to \pi\pi)$ and Fig. 2b correspond to zero order in $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$. They describe the direct decay $K^0 \to \pi\pi$. Figure 2c and term $\epsilon G(\bar{K}^0) M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to \pi\pi)$ correspond to the first order in $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$ and the all orders in V and H_W.

Similarly, for the $\bar{K}^0$ one obtains

$$M'(\bar{K}^0 \to \pi\pi) = M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to \pi\pi) + \epsilon G(K^0) M_d(K^0 \to \pi\pi). \tag{19}$$

In accordance with (14), the total in-medium amplitude $M'(K^0_L \to \pi\pi)$ is

$$M'(K^0_L \to \pi\pi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[M'(K^0 \to \pi\pi) + M'(\bar{K}^0 \to \pi\pi)] =$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[M_d(K^0 \to \pi\pi) + \epsilon G(\bar{K}^0) M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to \pi\pi) + M_d(\bar{K}^0 \to \pi\pi) + \epsilon G(K^0) M_d(K^0 \to \pi\pi)],$$

$$G(\bar{K}^0) = -G(K^0) = -1/V. \quad (20)$$

Our interest is with K^0_S regeneration and so we revert to K^0_L, K^0_S representation. In the amplitude $M_d(K^0 \to \pi\pi)$ the wave function of K^0 is given by (16). Since (15) and (16) are nearly equal, for (16) we use the vacuum relations identical to that for (15):

$$|K^0> = (|K^0_L> + |K^0_S>)/\sqrt{2},$$
$$|\bar{K}^0> = (|K^0_L> - |K^0_S>)/\sqrt{2}. \quad (21)$$

Finally

$$M'(K^0_L \to \pi\pi) = M_d(K^0_L \to \pi\pi) + \frac{\epsilon}{V} M_d(K^0_S \to \pi\pi). \quad (22)$$

Here $(\epsilon/V) M_d(K^0_S \to \pi\pi)$ is the amplitude of regeneration followed by decay, $M_d(K^0_S \to \pi\pi)$ is the in-medium amplitude of the decay $K^0_S \to \pi\pi$. The factor ϵ/V is the same as in Eqs. (6) and (10) what is obvious since K^0_L and K^0_S are the superposition of K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$.

The regeneration arises from difference between the K^0N- and $\bar{K}^0N$-intereactions which is included in V. Due to this we focused our attention on V- and Δm-dependences. The generalization for the relativistic case and the approach based on exact solution of equations of motion (see Sect. 5) will be presented in the following paper.

The calculation of process width is similar to that given by (11). We would like to emphasize the following. With the calculation of the total process probability, the result obtained by means of (22) should be multiplied by the factor

$$R = e^{-(\Gamma + \Gamma_a)t} \quad (23)$$

which is conditioned by decay and absorption of K^0 (Γ and Γ_a are the widths of decay and absorption of K^0, respectively). These processes have been not included in H_I or $K^0_m(x)$ since the corresponding values are not used in the calculation given above. In other words, the above-mentioned processes have been considered as background ones. The same is true for the process (1).

4 Comparison with previous calculation

The previous calculations (see, for example Eqs. (1) and (2) of Ref. [3] or Eq. (9.32) of Ref. [4] or Eqs. (7.83)-(7.89) of Ref. [5]) give

$$|K'_L>_{st} = |K_L> + r\,|K_S>,$$

$$r = i\pi N\Lambda f_{21}/[k(i\mu + 1/2)] \sim f_{21}/(i\Delta m/\Gamma_S + 1/2). \tag{24}$$

Here $\mid K'_L >_{st}$ is the in-medium state expressed through the vacuum states. The notations are the same as in [5]. In the more recent papers (see, for example, Refs. [11,12]) we did not find an alternative calculations and relation different from (24).

To compare with our calculation we write (22) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} M'(K^0_L \to \pi\pi) =& <\pi\pi \mid H_W \mid K'_L>, \\ \mid K'_L> =& \mid K_L> + \frac{\epsilon}{V} \mid K_S>, \\ \frac{\epsilon}{V} =& \frac{m}{4\pi N}\frac{\Delta m}{f_{21}}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Here ϵ/V is the amplitude of regenerated K^0_S. Compared to (24), the f_{21}- and Δm- dependences are inverse.

The amplitude of any ab transition is proportional to $\Delta m/V \sim \Delta m/f_{21}$. The identical factor takes place for the $n\bar{n}$ transition in the medium followed by annihilation [6-8, 13-15] and neutrino oscillations [16]. In (24) the inverse dependence takes place. It is important that Δm and f_{21} are the crucial values which define the process speed.

We also note that in the old calculation Eq. (21) is used as well (see Eq. (1) from Ref. [1]) since one cannot do without it.

The fundamental difference between our and previous calculations lies in the process model. We write the starting Eqs. (3) from [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_x - ink)K^0 = 0, \\ (\partial_x - in'k)\bar{K}^0 = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where n and n' are the index of refraction for K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$, respectively. In notations of Ref. [2] $K^0 = \alpha$ and $\bar{K}^0 = \alpha'$, $K^0_S = \alpha_1$ and $K^0_L = \alpha_2$. This follows from initial conditions [2]: $\alpha_2(0) = 1$, $\alpha_1(0) = 0$. There is no off-diagonal mass $\epsilon = (m_L - m_S)/2$ (see (2) and (3)). Equations (26) are non-coupled. The non-coupled equations exist only for the stationary states and don't exist for K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$.

In [2] Eq. (5) for $\alpha_{1,2}$ is obtained from (3) by means of change of variables and introduction of τ ($\tau = 1/\Gamma$). As in (3), there is no off-diagonal mass ϵ. Consequently, in [2] the off-diagonal mass term was omitted; Δm appears due to the fact that $m_{\alpha_1} \neq m_{\alpha_2}$ in the corresponding plane waves.

Suppose that α and α' correspond to the stationary states K^0_S and K^0_L. However, the index of refraction for K^0_L and K^0_S are unknown. Besides, in this case the values $\alpha_1(t)$ and $\alpha_2(t)$ obtained in [2] describe K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ and not K^0_S and K^0_L, whereas our interest is with K^0_S and K^0_L.

Equations (26) are due to the direct, erroneous analogy with ordinary optics (see paragraph before Eq. (1) of Ref. [2]). We deal with two non-stationary states (coupled equations).

Consequently, the stage of system evolution in the $(K^0, \bar{K}^0)$ representation described wrongly: the term $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$ has been omitted. Unfortunately, from the Eq. (4) of the original paper [1] it is difficult to understand the simple fact given above. With the results of [1] in [2,3] the Eq. (24) was obtained. It was subsequently included in [4,5] and other papers.

The reduction of the mass matrix to the diagonal form is only the change of variables. In the old calculations the term $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$ was omitted. This is fundamental error since it leads to a qualitative disagreement in the results. In our calculation the term $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$ involved in (8). In the approach given below (see Sect. 5) it is involved in the equations of motion.

5 Approach based on exact solution of equations of motion

Equation (22) was obtained in the first order in ϵ. One can attempt to solve the problem exactly. By analogy with Eqs. (14) and (21) the in-medium wave functions of K^0_S and K^0_L are

$$K^0_L(t) = [K^0(t) + \bar{K}^0(t)]/\sqrt{2},$$
$$K^0_S(t) = [K^0(t) - \bar{K}^0(t)]/\sqrt{2}. \qquad (27)$$

The exact solutions $K^0(t)$ and $\bar{K}^0(t)$ of Eqs. (2) and (3) are substituted into (27). The value $\mid K^0_S(t) \mid^2$ should be compared with the process probability corresponding to amplitude (22).

These calculations are rather cumbersome. There are non-trivial physical problems as well. For example, the optical potential was adapted for the Schrodinger-type equations. We deal with the system of equations (see [17] for more details). Equations (27) correspond to K^0_S in the final state, whereas (22) includes the decay $K^0_S \to \pi\pi$ as well.

We would like to emphasize the following. In the standard model of the $n\bar{n}$ transition based on equations of motion the optical theorem is used. This is wrong since the S-matrix is essentially non-unitary [18]. (For the oscillations in the external field [19,20] the Hamiltonian is Hermitian and so there is no similar problem.) In the calculation given above the optical theorem is not used.

6 Conclusion

In the old model [1-5] the $K^0(t)$ and $\bar{K}^0(t)$ are described by (26), which is wrong. Equations (26) are due to the erroneous analogy with ordinary optics [2]. K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$ correspond to

the non-stationary states and coupled equations of motion. Consequently, in the previous calculations the problem different from regeneration has been solved. Due to this our result differs fundamentally from previous one (see Eqs. (24) and (25)).

We propose the alternative model which is typical for the theory of the multistep processes. The result obtained above coincides with last calculation [21] based on exact solution of equation of motion. It is significant that width of $K_L^0 K_S^0$ transition (17) obtained in [21] coincides with Eq. (28) from [22] what can be considered as a test.

The calculation by means of perturbation theory is useful on the following reason. The exact calculation given in [21] is cumbersome and formal. (On non-principal refinements, it will be submitted to the journal.) So the calculation given above is the verification of the model based on exact solution. It has a transparent physical sense. It is also significant that in the approach based on diagram technique one can avoid the potential description of $\bar{K}^0$-medium interaction (see [10], for example). This is essential since the potential description is crude due to the strong absorption of $\bar{K}^0$.

In the approach based on exact solution of equations of motion [21] we start from (2) and (3) and not (26). In Sect. 3 of this paper we make the same in the framework of perturbation theory. The Hamiltonian and initial state wave function are given by (8) and (16), respectively. The perturbation theory in ϵ is used. The parameter ϵ is extremely small. The regeneration amplitude involves the all orders in V and H_W and the first order in $H_{K^0\bar{K}^0}$.

We do not overestimate the role of regeneration. Δm is extracted from free-space oscillations without recourse to V, i.e., potentials of K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$. Nevertheless, in any case the process should be described correctly. We continue our consideration in the following paper.

References

[1] K.M. Case, Phys. Rev. **103**, 1449 (1956).

[2] M.L. Good, Phys. Rev. **106**, 591 (1957).

[3] M.L. Good, Phys. Rev. **110**, 550 (1958).

[4] T.D. Lee and C.S. Wu, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **16**, 511 (1966).

[5] E.D. Commins and P. H. Bucksbaum, *Weak Interactions of Leptons and Quarks* (Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[6] V.I. Nazaruk, Phys. Lett. B **337**, 328 (1994).

[7] V.I. Nazaruk, Phys. Rev. C **58**, R1884 (1998).

[8] V.I. Nazaruk, Eur. Phys. J. C **53**, 573 (2008).

[9] V.I. Nazaruk, Int. J. of Mod. Phys. E **20**, 2377 (2011).

[10] J.H. Christenson et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1212 (1979).

[11] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, R. Romano, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 094007 (2003).

[12] G. Amelino-Camelia et al., Eur. Phys. J. C **68**, 619 (2010).

[13] R.N. Mohapatra and R.E. Marshak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 1316 (1980).

[14] P.G.H. Sandars, J. Phys. **G6**, L161 (1980).

[15] M.V. Kazarnovsky et al., Pisma. Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **32**, 88 (1980).

[16] F. Boehm and P.Vogel, *Physics of massive neutrino* (Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[17] V.I. Nazaruk, Eur. Phys. J. A **31**, 177 (2007).

[18] V.I. Nazaruk, Int. J. of Mod. Phys. E **21**, 1250056 (2012).

[19] Xian-Wei Kang, Hai-Bo Li and Gong-Ru Lu, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 051901 (R) (2010).

[20] H. B. Li and M. Z. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 094016 (2006).

[21] V.I. Nazaruk, arXiv:1604.04547 [hep-ph].

[22] B.O. Kerbikov, M.S. Lukashov, Y.A. Kamyshkov, L.J. Varriano, arXiv:1512.03398 [hep-ph].